

REMARKS

This Submission replies to the substance of the Office Action dated November 16, 2005 and the Advisory Action dated March 7, 2006. Claims 1, 13 and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-22 and 24-31 remain pending in this case.

Substance of Interview Summary

Applicants appreciate the opportunity to discuss aspects of the claimed invention with Examiner Basehoar. In the telephonic interview with the Examiner on March 28, 2006, the undersigned representative for the Applicants discussed claim 1 in view of the previously cited references Miller and Newbold. In the interview, the undersigned representative and Examiner Basehoar discussed the differences between claim 1 and the combination of Miller and Newbold, and possible amendments to claim 1 to further distinguish the claim from the combination of Miller and Newbold.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-9 and 11-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,896,321) (“*Miller*”) in view of Newbold et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,576,955) (“*Newbold*”). Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended claim 1 recites a method for correcting text input into a text document, comprising the steps of, *inter alia*, in response to receiving the command to display the list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, submitting the erroneous text component to a correction scope model to determine if a scope of correction should be adjusted, wherein the correction scope model uses at least a natural language model and an input methods model in determining the scope of correction.

Amended claim 13 recites a method for correcting text input into a text document, comprising the steps of, *inter alia*, in response to receiving the command to display the list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, submitting the erroneous text component to a correction scope model to determine if a scope of correction should be adjusted, wherein the correction scope model uses at least a natural language model and an input methods model in determining the scope of correction.

Amended claim 20 recites a method for correcting text input into a text document, comprising the steps of, *inter alia*, in response to receiving the command to display the list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, submitting the erroneous text component to a correction scope model to determine if a scope of correction should be adjusted, wherein the correction scope model uses at least an input methods model in determining the scope of correction.

Miller discloses a text completion system that automatically displays a prioritized list of completion suggestions for a partial data entry in response to a pause in receipt of the data entry. (*See Miller* column 4, lines 29-50.) *Miller* also discloses that if a complete data entry does not correspond to an entry in the dictionary, the word prediction system adds the complete data entry to the dictionary and deletes another data entry from the dictionary. (*See Miller* column 7, lines 7-10.) The word prediction system also adds the complete data entry to a list of recently received words. (*See Miller* column 7, lines 10-19.)

Newbold discloses a method and apparatus for handling errors in a data processing environment. (*See Newbold* column 3, lines 19-20.) *Newbold* also discloses an error unit which can detect errors such as “spelling, usage, custom usage, punctuation, broken words, doubled words, capitalization, and spacing. (*See Newbold* column 4, lines 16-19.) *Newbold* has the capability to address any type of error and identifies errors as mechanical or non-mechanical errors. (*See Newbold* column 4, lines 20-22.) A mechanical error is an error that is context-sensitive, and is best understood by viewing the error in the text in which it occurred. (*See Newbold* column 4, lines 22-24.) Examples of mechanical errors are punctuation, broken words, doubled words, capitalization, and spacing. (*See Newbold* column 4, lines 24-26.) Non-mechanical errors can usually be communicated without viewing the error in its context. Examples of non-mechanical errors are spelling and usage.” (*See Newbold* column 4, lines 26-29.) *Newbold* also discloses an error list. (*See Newbold* column 4, line 30.) “Once the text has been scanned for errors, the present invention builds a list of the detected errors at 150 in FIG. 2. The Error List is used to communicate errors (either mechanical or non-mechanical errors) to the user in a more intuitive manner than prior art systems. The Error List provides the ability to communicate the errors outside of the context of the

original text. This results in a greater number of errors being displayed on the screen, and provides the ability to scan the errors to determine the manner in which to approach the correction of the errors.” (See *Newbold* column 4, lines 33-43.)

The Office Action acknowledges that *Miller* fails to teach or suggest submitting erroneous text to an correction scope model to determine the scope of correction in text and, if the scope of the correction should be adjusted, receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the erroneous text component and at least one text component from the text selection adjacent the erroneous text component. In order to overcome this deficiency in *Miller*, the Office Action relies on *Newbold*. However, *Newbold* fails to remedy all the deficiencies in *Miller*.

In contrast, the combination of *Miller* and *Newbold* fails to teach or suggest, in response to receiving the command to display the list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, submitting the erroneous text component to a correction scope model to determine if a scope of correction should be adjusted, wherein the correction scope model uses at least a natural language model and an input methods model in determining the scope of correction, as recited in claim 1. As mentioned in the Office Action, *Miller* fails to address such a limitation. *Newbold* also fails to mention a correction scope model using at least a natural language model and an input methods model in determining the scope of correction, because *Newbold* is merely associated with proofreading text and therefore does not account for contextual errors that occur when receiving stochastic input. Thus, *Miller* and *Newbold*, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 1, including the overall combination of elements defined by this claim. Accordingly, independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited prior art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 1. Dependent Claims 2-12, 28 and 31 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding Independent Claim 1, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-12, 28 and 31.

Claims 13 and 20 include recitations similar to the recitation mentioned above with respect to Claim 1 and are patentably distinguishable from the cited prior art for the reasons mentioned above with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully

requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 13 and 20. Dependent Claims 14-19 and 29 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding Independent Claim 13 and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 13. Dependent Claims 21-27 and 30 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding Independent Claim 20 and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 20.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miller* in view of *Newbold* further in view of *Oberteuffer et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,523) (“*Oberteuffer*”). Applicants respectfully submit that amendments to claim 1 overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

As mentioned above, the combination of *Miller* and *Newbold* fails to teach or suggest all the recitations of claim 1. Accordingly, Dependent Claim 10 is also allowable over the combination of *Miller* and *Newbold* at least for the reasons described above regarding Independent Claim 1 and by virtue of its dependency upon independent Claim 1.

Oberteuffer discloses a computer system 100 which can receive several types of devices for providing gesture interaction with mode processing logic 104. FIG. 9 is a block diagram of computer system 100 for processing gesture, handwritten, and hand-drawn input and speech input comprising several of the elements. (See *Oberteuffer* column 7, lines 44-48.)

In contrast with the combination defined by claim 10, *Oberteuffer* fails to teach or suggest, in response to receiving the command to display the list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, submitting the erroneous text component to a correction scope model to determine if a scope of correction should be adjusted, wherein the correction scope model uses at least a natural language model and an input methods model in determining the scope of correction, as recited in claim 1. While *Oberteuffer* may disclose various ways to recognize handwritten, hand-drawn and speech input, *Oberteuffer* fails to disclose any need for a correction scope model because *Oberteuffer* does not address errors in text. Accordingly, independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited prior art. Dependent Claim 10 is also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding Independent Claim 1, and by

virtue of its dependency upon independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claim 10.

CONCLUSION

A request for a three-month extension of time is requested for the period of February 16, 2006 through May 16, 2006, and is submitted with this amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application and allowance of the claims at an early date are hereby solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's undersigned attorney at (404) 954-5040.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC

Date: April 28, 2006



Devon K. Grant
Reg. No. 57,036

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
(404) 954.5100

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE